





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,033	10/09/2001	Thomas M. Stephany	83469PCW	5066
75	90 06/22/2004		EXAM	INER
Thomas H. Close			SANTIAGO, ENRIQUE L	
Patent Legal Staff Eastman Kodak Company			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
343 State Street			2671	8
Rochester, NY 14350-2201			DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/973,033	STEPHANY ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Enrique L Santiago	2671			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied applied on is a)	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<u> </u>			
10. Other:	M	8 6			
	/"land	AAMEN ZIMAAAN			
		MARK ZIMMERMAN RVISORY PATENT EXAMINER CHNOLOGY CENTER 2600			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment "a visual pictorial representation of an actual object" raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Regarding the applicants argument that "The claimed invention includes the advantage of supporting illiterate persons and persons with impaired vision since, in the case of impaired vision, the pictorial representation may be more recognizable than sequential letters that may be seen as a "blur."" said limitation is not in the claims.